

## **REMARKS**

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the Office Action dated May 18, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as the "Office Action"), having a shortened statutory period for response that expires August 18, 2006. At the time of the last examination, Claims 65-104 were pending, of which Claims 65-86 and 98-104 were withdrawn from consideration. By this amendment, the withdrawn claims are cancelled, thereby leaving only Claims 87-97 pending. Of these remaining claims, only Claims 87, 88 and 89 are independent. Claims 87 and 88 are amended. All of the dependent claims depend from Claim 89. Claims 89 and its dependent claims are allowed, and thus the only claims at issue in this patent application are now Claims 87 and 88.

Section 3 of the Office Action rejected Claims 87 and 88 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States patent number 5,978,386 issued to Hamalainen, et al. (the patent hereinafter referred to as "Hamalainen") in view of United States patent number 6,636,505 issued to Wang, et al. (the patent hereinafter referred to as "Wang").

The present invention of claims 87 and 88 identifies one PPP frame of first data (data being not octet-inserted and not bit-inserted) in a lower layer than PPP. In this way, when one PPP frame can be identified in a lower layer than PPP, the data transmission amount can be reduced by not conducting octet insertion nor bit insertion.

In contrast, neither Hamalainen nor Wang discloses the above-mentioned feature of the present invention of the claims 87 and 88, i.e. "identifying one PPP frame of the first data (data being not octet-inserted and not bit-inserted) in a lower layer than PPP".

That is, regarding Hamalainen, as the Office Action admits in page 2 of the current Office Action, Hamalainen does not disclose identifying one PPP frame in a lower layer than PPP.

Regarding Wang et al, the PPP packet that Wang treats is a normal PPP Packet, i.e. data being octet-inserted or bit-inserted. Thus, Wang et al does not disclose "identifying one PPP frame of first data (data being not octet-inserted and not bit-inserted) in a lower layer than PPP".

Therefore, even the combination of Hamalainen and Wang do not disclose every feature of either of Claims 87 and 88. For instance, the combination does not teach or suggest "identifying one PPP frame of first data (data being not octet-inserted and not bit-inserted) in a lower layer than PPP".

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 11<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/ADRIAN J. LEE/

Adrian J. Lee  
Registration No. 42,785  
Attorney for Applicants  
Customer No. 022913

AJL:ds  
DS0000006357V001